



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

M

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,423	12/03/2001	Tapesh Yadav	A21	4189

7590 09/16/2002

Stuart T. Langley, Esq.
Hogan & Hartson, LLP
Suite 1500
1200 17th Street
Denver, CO 80202

EXAMINER

RAEVIS, ROBERT R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2856

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/001,423	YADAV ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert R. Raevs	2856	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appars on the cover sheet with the correspond enc address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-12, drawn to an electroded nanostructured device, classified in class 427, subclass 58+.
 - II. Claim 14, drawn to sensor with nanostructured material, classified in class 73, subclass 23.2+.
 - III. Claim 15, drawn to sensor with sensitive quantum layer material, classified in class 73, subclass 23.2+.
 - IV. Claim 16, drawn to sensor with heating layer, classified in class 73, subclass 25.01.
 - V. Claim 17, drawn to sensor with a plurality confined quantum layers, classified in class 73, subclass 23.2.
 - VI. Claim 18, drawn to sensor with polymer (protective) layer, classified in class 73, subclass 23.2.
 - VII. Claim 19, drawn to sensor with ceramic (protective) layer, classified in class 73, subclass 23.2.
 - VIII. Claim 20, drawn to sensor with composite (protective) layer, classified in class 73, subclass 23.2.
- Claim 13 lines inventions II-VIII, and will of course be examined with the elected group.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II-VIII and I are related as combination and subcombination.

Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because all of the limitations of I are not in II-VIII. The subcombination has separate utility such as an electrode for any type electrical device, not necessarily measuring related.

3. Inventions II-VIII are all related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because each of claims 14-20 do not include all of the limitations of any of the other claims. In addition, each of the claim has separate utility in the sensor art. For example, claims 14-17 can utilize a (protective) layer other than that called for in claims 18-20, for example a coating. (Note that claims 18-20 appear to be different species, as they call for different (protective) layers.) In addition, claims 14, 15 and 17 may be used with a sensor that does not demand use of a heater as called for in claim 16, and may be used to sense force. Additionally, claims 14 and 15 may be carried out by use of only one that employs the sensitive quantum

Art Unit: 2856

confined material as a test material. Finally, claim 15 may utilize a layer that is other than the claimed "nanostructured" material of claim 14, and may be a coating of a parameter sensitive material.

4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for each group is different, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. **If Applicant elects any of Groups II-VIII, disregard the remainder of Paragraph No 5, and proceed to Paragraph No 6 below. However, if Applicants elect Group I, and election of species is as follows:**

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: any either claim 7 or claim 8 or claim 9 or claim 10 or claim 11 or claim 12 or claim 3 or claim 4 or claim 5 or claim 6.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1 and 2 are generic (to claims 7-12).

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include

all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert R. Raevis whose telephone number is 703-305-4919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 6:30am to 4:00pm. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-308-7722.

*Robert
AU 2856
RAEVIS*